Task 2
EXISTING BAY AREA PARKING POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a summary of an effort to document and review the ranges and types of parking policy guides, manuals, standards and programs which are currently being applied throughout the Bay Area. The purpose of the paper is to identify the major local and national parking policy resources which are available to assist Bay Area cities and jurisdictions which are attempting to understand the parking dynamics of their own communities. This paper investigates where typical parking policies, requirements, and practices are appropriate, and areas where candidates for or current examples of Smart Growth or Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) initiatives call for parking policies that reflect site-specific conditions. As such, the paper will also focus on jurisdictions that are currently managing constrained parking conditions with smart growth or TOD policies and programs. Readers who desire more detail on any of the topics can refer to the companion technical paper from which this summary was derived.

WHY PARKING POLICY IS IMPORTANT

In the early part of the 20th Century most cities had well developed transit networks which supported a dense core of urban development. These cities embodied all the principles of what today we call TOD. By mid-century the growing popularity of the automobile brought about major changes in development trends and transportation policy. Transit declined as the infrastructure to support the automobile became the dominant feature in our cities. As land becomes scarcer and travel by automobile becomes more difficult, the idea of transit-oriented urban cores has re-emerged. However, many cities find that their efforts to encourage new in-fill development are being hampered by conventional parking policies that fail to recognize that less parking is needed where transit and mixed use development are plentiful. These policies, which were intended to assure that ample parking would be provided, are now a significant barrier to economic growth and development. Other policies designed to provide free or very low cost parking are now preventing cities from effectively managing the parking that they do have.

With the complex economic, institutional, and implementation issues surrounding smart growth and TOD initiatives, the relationship between smart growth and parking needs to be explored. There are a broad spectrum of parking policies options available such as revised parking requirements, maximums, minimums, caps, cash out and variable pricing strategies on- and off-street. In order to effectively consider these options, it is important to understand the foundation of existing parking policies.

Many cities have developed their parking zoning ordinances and related parking policies by examining those of their perceived peer cities. The most successful parking solutions are those tailored to the individual community and political environment. However, parking policies are often developed through standardized national guides such as the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Parking Generation. Cities are often unaware of alternative parking demand assessment tools from resources such as the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) Shared Parking or Dimensions of Parking by the National Parking Association in partnership with ULI. Cities also need extensive stakeholder input and buy-in to effectively engage or understand the implications of past changes in parking policy and the perceived potential effects of new policies. For example, economic, policy and implementation issues surrounding revised parking requirements or variable pricing strategies are often controversial with particular stakeholder groups such as business owners or new developers. Stakeholders with strong financial ties and residents who feel parking should be reserved for the neighborhood, find changes to parking availability as a forced change in living standards.

KEY FINDINGS

The survey and review of the parking requirements and policies currently used by Bay Area cities revealed the following:

1. Much of the classic literature on parking is oriented towards auto-dependent suburban land uses, separated from each other, where parking is offered free to the user. The ability to accurately predict parking demand outside of these circumstances is limited.
2. Cities seeking to develop new parking policies and programs have a number of technical resources available to them. These are documented in this paper. However, many of the resources offer limited and confusing information for cities seeking to modify their parking requirements or to develop other parking management policies.
3. Cities tend to copy the parking requirements adopted by their neighbors and other peer cities rather than invest the major effort required to develop requirements that are truly relevant to the city's characteristics and goals. This approach is appealing because it is easily defensible when the time comes to justify the results to the decision makers.
4. Most cities have a one-size fits all uniform parking requirement which covers the entire city. Parking requirements in these cities do not change with density and transit availability, which prevents smart growth and TOD development in those areas which have good levels of transit access.
5. Many Bay Area cities have adopted policies and programs specifically designed to promote smart growth and TOD already.
6. Traditional concepts of land use and parking are hard to displace. Any successful effort to adopt progressive parking policies must address the numerous concerns of the various stakeholder groups and the political decision makers.
7. Because many cities have already taken the steps to adopt progressive parking management policies and measures, the other cities can benefit directly from their experience. The perceived risks of being a pioneering community can be diminished through sharing of experiences and information, which is one of the key objectives of this project.

The Bay Area consists of a broad diversity of cities and communities most of which have intensified their commitments to smart growth and TOD goals and policies. This paper explores this diversity and describes the issues and concerns regarding current parking policies. The paper is organized into four primary sections which are presented below:

Section I - Standardized National Parking Guides and Manuals

Section II – Existing Bay Area Parking Policies

Section III – Programs for Infill, TOD and Downtown Areas

Section IV – Understanding and Addressing Parking Issues and Concerns

SECTION I – STANDARDIZED NATIONAL PARKING GUIDES AND MANUALS

This section presents a review of various national parking resources such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE's) Parking Generation (Third Edition), Dimensions of Parking by the National Parking Association in partnership with ULI, Flexible Parking Requirements by the American Planning Association (APA), Parking by Weant and Levinson and the ENO Foundation, Parking 101 and 102 by the International

Parking Institute, TRB and TCRP sources and other national research studies. In addition, resources which support reduction of parking space requirements through mixed use scenarios such as the Urban Land Institute's Shared Parking (Second Edition) are also reviewed and summarized. Please note that where these resources discuss parking demand, they typically refer to the demand for free parking. In the pure economic sense, demand is a function of price. Subsidies like free parking create economic inefficiencies, where more of a resource is consumed than would be the case if it were sold for its full cost. This inefficiency is what creates the space for optimization.

The reviews resulted in the following conclusions:

Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Parking Generation*

While this document is the best source of parking demand data by land use type, cities hoping to develop parking policies supportive of smart growth and TOD will generally not find this resource very helpful. The information tends to be for suburban land uses and generally is not applicable to urban and semi-urban settings. Given this information, city analysts (planners, engineers, and others) can assess the amount of parking anticipated to be generated by a proposed land use development or the estimated parking demand generated by existing uses.

National Parking Association/Urban Land Institute's *Dimensions of Parking*

While this document is a good general resource for information about most aspects of parking, there is not much information in this publication to assist cities interested in smart growth or TOD oriented parking policies. Some of the topics which are described in Dimensions of Parking are a review of the analysis tools which help assess parking needs; the potential costs of providing new parking; the development of local land use and zoning requirements; and the elements of functional parking design. These topics can help cities understand the economic value of parking as a basic element of most land uses and the long-term capital investment associated with it. Cities can use Dimensions of Parking as a guide to address local zoning requirements as well as the functional design of new parking facilities. Dimensions of Parking also describes the need of parking studies to understand the adequacy of parking influences on public and private sector investments. A lot of topics are addressed; however, one drawback of this document is that there is not much detail provided.

American Planning Association's *Flexible Parking Requirements*

Given the variability of parking within different communities, the American Planning Association (APA) has developed recommendations to assist cities and jurisdictions create flexible parking regulations. Flexible Parking Requirements describes a six step parking assessment approach for city planners and engineers to use when setting parking standards or requirements. Although the approach outlined is fairly effective and reliable, APA notes that "this method…is labor intensive and is more often neglected by municipalities in favor of 'borrowing' codes from other zoning ordinances." This document is an excellent resource for cities to use to establish parking requirements which reflect actual local characteristics and which provide the degree of flexibility required to encourage innovation in development practices.

Weant and Levinson and the Eno Foundation's *Parking*

In the publication entitled *Parking*, Weant and Levinson in collaboration with the ENO Foundation take a comprehensive view of parking, covering a broad range of topics. *Parking* reviews a variety of topics from assessing different types of parking demands to citing examples of parking experiences throughout the nation. The types of discussions which could be beneficial and applicable for Bay Area cities include:

Parking Demand - This resource provides an approach to associating parking requirements to appropriately assessed parking demands. In general, *Parking* cites that peak parking demands should

represent the "85 percentile" of demand values or that, on average, the demand should be exceeded by only 15 percent of the time. Therefore, the minimum zoning requirements should be set at around five to ten percent more than the peak demands. However, these parking requirements should be adjusted for the accessibility effects of transit and walk-in traffic. In addition, lowered parking requirements should be established for retail, restaurants, and entertainment land uses that are within close proximity (1,000 foot walking distance) to office workers and multi-use developments should allow for shared parking among individual uses.

Parking Requirements - *Parking* also describes the types of allowances that should be made for shared parking including parking requirements for multi-use developments. These requirements should be based on the observed peak period for maximum parking demand and information about the estimated daytime and evening demands for specific uses. Given this information shared parking requirements can be appropriately applied to effectively use the multiple types of land uses in the multi-use developments. *Parking* also outlines a general approach to reducing parking requirements for the City Center/Central Business District (CBD). In this approach *Parking* suggests that parking requirements reflect multi-destination trips as well as the availability and proximity to public transportation. In these instances, parking requirements for retail users should be reduced up to 50 percent from those requirements established for similar uses in suburban settings and additional reductions should be made to account for transit riders.

Min/Max Districts - In the Bay Area, those cities that are particularly well served by transit, "min/max" districts can be established. For these districts, a minimum number of parking spaces are required according to the development intensity and transit availability, but developers also must limit the amount of parking provides so as to not exceed the maximum requirement for the area. For example, in an area zoned at a high density with high transit accessibility, a development would be limited to a maximum number of allowable spaces. In an area zoned at a medium density, developers could be required to provide both a minimum and a maximum number of allowable spaces, while developers building in a lower density area would have only a minimum number of allowable spaces required. These min/max districts can be tailored to specific sites within cities such as redevelopment sites or new development areas.

The concepts presented in this document can be very helpful to cities considering parking policies which support smart growth and TOD.

Urban Land Institute's *Shared Parking*

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) report *Shared Parking*, presents the findings of shared parking research over the past 22 years. In its first publication in 1983, *Shared Parking* established a methodology for shared parking analysis. In its revised second publication (2005), the aim was to review and assess whether the established methodology was still appropriate in the present context, in light of lifestyle changes that have led to an overall increase of the use of automobiles. A meeting of parking experts concluded that the methodology first established was still appropriate, however, the default values needed to be updated. This was of particular importance as the ITE found that almost half of all local governments surveyed had incorporated some shared parking into local codes either directly or as an option and they cited the ULI shared parking methodology.

The goal of shared parking is to find the balance between providing adequate parking to support new development or redevelopment, while minimizing the negative aspects of excessive land area or resources devoted to parking. As a result, *Shared Parking* (Second Edition) provides updated parking demand information including:

- Separate parking rates for visitors, customer, employees, residents, and other users;
- Updated information and definitions for "weekday" and "weekend" conditions;

- Additional information on mode choice;
- New captive market adjustments; and
- New and refined land use scenarios.

As stated above, the methodology of *Shared Parking* is still appropriate in the present context. For cities to consider potential shared parking opportunities, a nine step system is described in *Shared Parking* is briefly summarized below:

Step 1: Gather and Review Project Data

Step 2: Selecting Parking Demand Ratios

Step 3: Select Factors and Analyze Differences in Activity Patterns

Step 4: Develop Scenarios for Critical Parking Need Periods

Step 5: Adjust Ratios for Modal Split and Persons per Car

Step 6: Apply Noncaptive Adjustments

Step 7: Calculate Required Parking spaces for Each Scenario

Step 8: Determine Whether Scenarios Reflect All Critical Parking Needs

Step 9: Recommend a Parking Plan

Shared Parking is an excellent resource for cities to develop parking requirements for specific projects, land uses, and combination of land uses. The methodology is, however, fairly labor intensive. The base parking demand ratios that are provided are largely for suburban land use types, and as a result care must be taken when applying these ratios to and urban or semi-urban settings.

Donald Shoup's *The High Cost of Free Parking*

No publication on the subject of parking has stimulated as much discussion and interest as *The High Cost of Free Parking* by Donald Shoup. Shoup, a professor of planning at the University of California, Los Angeles, has spent most of his career researching parking and land use relationships. The book draws upon his many years of research to present several fundamental conclusions:

- Minimum parking requirements that are designed to assure adequate parking generally result in an oversupply of parking, particularly when they assume that the parking will be free.
- The practices used by most cities to set their parking requirements are inherently flawed. Many cities set their requirements by consulting with their neighbor cities or perceived peer cities. The result is that the parking requirements have no scientific basis or rationale.
- While many view the idea of ample free parking as a sign of good planning and a stimulant to business, in reality free parking has significant costs associated with it.
- Efforts to keep parking free or very low cost often results in situations where the parking supply is saturated. The result is that customers come to the area and cannot find parking. Cruising for parking is a key result.
- To free up the parking supply and reduce cruising, Shoup recommends pricing the parking. Prices should be adjusted to a point where the price is high enough to reduce the average occupancy of the spaces to the 85% level. At this level, costumers should find it easy to find parking.

- When parking fees are charged in a district as a means of managing demand, Shoup also recommends that the net revenue be returned to the district to fund improvements to parking and transportation This approach should help overcome the inherent resistance to increased parking fees that most merchants commonly express.

The High Cost of Free Parking is a good introduction to many of the basic principles and concepts surrounding the development and implementation of parking policy. It is well written and comprehensive. The conclusions or recommendations could be used by cities to modify their parking programs and policies in ways which would support smart growth and TOD. It does advocate these particular approaches, and does not fully explore other types of programs or policies which might lead to similar results.

Victoria Transport Policy Institute's *Parking Solutions A Comprehensive Menu of Solutions to Parking Problems*

The Victoria Transport Policy Institute under the leadership of Todd Littman, its founder and director, has developed a website entitled *Parking Solutions A Comprehensive Menu of Solutions to Parking Problems* < http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm72.htm >. The website is unique in that it provides an accessible on-line source of information regarding solutions to common parking problems. This website is a good resource for information of parking policies and programs which are supportive of TOD and Smart Growth. Littman assembled these ideas into his book *Parking Management Best Practices*.

SECTION II – EXISTING BAY AREA PARKING POLICIES

Parking standards and guidelines are typically summarized in the zoning ordinances of Bay Area cities. The majority of the parking space requirements are based on total square footages or other factors for specific uses such as number of employees, theater seats, or even bowling lanes or gas pumps. These standards are based on specific codes that establish the number of required spaces by land use type and size. The importance of these regulations is such that they have a direct impact on the supply of parking in the downtowns of Bay Area cities.

Some cities establish these standards with reference to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation or one or more of the other resource documents noted earlier in this paper. Most cities, however, tend to use the parking standards of neighboring cities or their perceived peer cities. In many cases there is no true factual or scientific basis to the standards which the cities commonly use. The importance of these regulations is such that they have a direct impact on the supply of parking in the downtowns of Bay Area cities.

Table 1 below compares the residential parking requirements for 15 Bay Area cities based on their population and density the cities have been grouped into three categories:

1. Low-Suburban – cities with low densities and low levels of transit availability;
2. High-Suburban – cities with moderate densities and transit availability; and
3. Urban – cities with high densities and high transit availability.

Table 1
RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE-FAMILY DWELLING MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Area Type	Number of spaces per dwelling unit			
	Studio	**1-Bedroom**	**2-Bedrooms**	**3+ Bedrooms**
Low-Suburban	Average: 1.4	Average: 1.5	Average: 1.9	Average: 2.0
Dublin	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Hayward	1.5	1.7	2.1	2.25
Hercules(1)	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
Menlo Park	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.0
Morgan Hill	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.5
Mountain View	1.8	1.8	2.3	2.3
Redwood City	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
San Rafael(2)	1.0	1.5	1.5	2.0
Union City	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0
Vallejo(3)	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
Walnut Creek	1.25	1.5	2.0	2.1
High-Suburban	Average: 1.1	Average: 1.2	Average: 1.4	Average: 1.5
Berkeley	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
El Cerrito	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5
San Mateo	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.0
Urban				
San Francisco	0 (4)	0 (4)	0 (4)	0 (4)

Source: MTC *Parking Study Inventory*, 2002; Wilbur Smith Associates July 2006

Notes:

(1) Hercules' requirements based on the Central Hercules Plan Regulating Code.

(2) San Rafael's requirements based on the Downtown Parking Assessment District.

(3) Vallejo's requirements based on the Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan for the Central Downtown.

(4) Note as of May 24, 2006, San Francisco's Downtown Residential District (DTR) and *C-3* Districts have no minimum off-street accessory parking requirement for residential uses.

The variation of minimum parking requirements among the cities can be explained based on their density and transit use characteristics. The residential parking standards for downtowns across the Bay Area are similar among cities within the same area type. Comparing city type to city type, minimum parking requirements for multi-family housing reflect land use conditions and the availability of transit service within each of the three city type categories. In suburban cities like Union City, Morgan Hill, and Hayward, where densities are lower with more public transit options, minimum parking requirements are high at 1.5 to 2.25 per unit. For cities in more urban settings like Berkeley where densities are higher and transit service is highly accessible, minimum parking requirements are significantly lower, at 1.0 space per unit for all residential uses, or in the case of San Francisco, there are no minimums, and instead maximums there are maximum parking levels in the downtown.

A similar pattern was noted for the same 15 cities for the zoning requirements for their office and retail land uses. Thus, even though the origin of the parking zoning requirements used by the cities may not be scientifically based, the cities have tailored their requirements to some degree to their density and transit use characteristics. However, there are big variations in the range of requirements for the suburban cities in particular. In general the reasons for these variations are difficult to explain and reflect the somewhat subjective approach that is used to set parking requirements.

SECTION III –PROGRAMS FOR INFILL, TOD AND DOWNTOWN AREAS

Many Bay Area cities have a single uniform parking zoning policy that covers uses throughout the city. A review was conducted to determine if many Bay Area cities have existing smart growth and TOD parking policies, programs and practices which are related to areas with high density uses such as infill sites, town centers, TOD sites or areas/districts typically designated within a downtown. The finding was that many cities already have adopted policies that would be considered supportive of smart growth and TOD.

The following are common guiding policies/objectives Bay Area communities have committed to as they promote smart growth principles in their individual cities:

- Encourage mixed-use high density development with connectivity and efficient use of parking. For example, the City of Dublin's Implementing Policies (D) of the Downtown Core Specific Plan states "encourage mid-rise office apartment buildings and parking structures with ground floor retail space. Create store-lined pedestrian connections between existing shopping centers."
- Coordinate parking with private development and public improvements in the downtown to promote and foster residential, office, and retail activities. As stated in the City of Mountain View's Downtown Precise Plan Development Objectives, parking related goals such as providing incentives and shared parking facilities will support increased activity in the core areas of the downtown.
- Create supportive parking controls and requirements that advance parking management plans and alternative transportation options. Under the City of Walnut Creek's Comprehensive (BART) Station Area Plan, (Land Use and Quality of Life), the City encourages high-density commercial and residential development through supportive parking requirements. These requirements also include adjustments for parking controls based on the TSM and TDM programs such as increased bus capacity and shared parking associated with TOD development in the immediate station area.

In an effort to promote increased development density in areas with good transit access, numerous Bay Area cities have revised their zoning policies to allow for increased Floor to Area Ratios (FAR's) in core downtown or infill areas. Higher FAR's translate into increased concentration of uses and overall higher-density development that promotes non-auto opportunities such as transit hubs. Revisions to FAR's maximums have allowed for the creation of "overlay districts" throughout many cities in the Bay Area.

An overlay district is a defined special purpose area which has different requirements, programs, or plans within a City's downtown or other designated area. For example, the Transit Overlay Zone in the City of Mountain View has allowed the creation of a neighborhood that is integrated with a new light rail station. Within the Transit Zone, the City has been able to require developers to incorporate design features more common to pedestrian-oriented urban areas and to retrofit the off-street circulation system for pedestrians and bicyclists.

In addition to reduced parking requirements, other policies which cities commonly use to support increased density and smart growth include:

- In-lieu fees – this policy gives the developer the option to pay a fee associated with the cost of parking in the area, in-lieu of providing the required parking on-site.
- Parking districts – a mechanism to allow parking revenues and in some cases property assessments to be used to fund parking or other transportation improvements. As a result developers may not be required to provide on-site parking.

- Increased FAR – this allows higher densities, sometimes offered to developers as an incentive if they agree to participate in TSM/TDM programs.
- TSM/TDM programs – there require or encourage developers to participate in programs designed to reduce parking demand such as discounted or free transit passes, carsharing, ridesharing, bicycle amenities, flexible work-hours, etc.
- Specific Plans – the specific plan process allows a city to adopt special zoning requirements and policies in an area of special significance.

Table 2 is a summary of the types of progressive smart growth oriented policies that are currently in place in 14 Bay Area communities.

Table 2
CITIES WITH TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PARKING POLICIES

	Reduced Parking Req.	In-lieu Fees	Parking Districts	Increased FAR	TSM/TDM Programs	Specific Plan
Dublin	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Hayward	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Hercules	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Menlo Park			✓		✓	
Morgan Hill	✓	✓		✓		✓
Mountain View	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Redwood City	✓		✓			✓
San Rafael	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Union City	✓	✓				✓
Vallejo					✓	✓
Walnut Creek	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Berkeley	✓	✓		✓	✓	
El Cerrito	✓	✓	✓			
San Mateo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco	✓	✓		✓	✓	

Source: MTC *Parking Study Inventory*, 2002, City Zoning and Municipal Codes, Specific Area/Downtown Plans

As the table shows, each of the 14 cities surveyed have in place one or more of these types of policies and programs. Thus many cities in the Bay Area have already implemented parking policies supportive of smart growth and TOD.

SECTION IV – UNDERSTANDING AND ADDRESSING PARKING ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Given the vested parking interests of local and citywide stakeholders, parking policy changes are often a controversial and politically contentious topic. Some cities have successfully approached parking issues by reviewing their past parking policy implementation so they can anticipate what issues and concerns would need to be addressed.

Current land use patterns reflect the dominance of automobile and the application of zoning codes which have separated land uses so far away from each other that they reinforce the automobile as the principal mode of transportation. As communities begin to feel the impacts of an auto-based landscape through increased congestion and time lost spent in traffic, they begin to look for alternatives.

Innovative parking policies offer alternatives and present unique opportunities for cities to grow and develop. However, as with any new approach to conventional methods, there exists some resistance to change. Communities seek to be involved in the changes that most affect them; as such it is only natural that they voice their concerns. The following and the major concerns that are often stumbling blocks in effort to adopt progressive parking policies:

Community Stakeholders

Business owners in the downtowns and commercial districts have traditionally viewed parking as the lifeline which keeps them in business. Residents want to be assured that their residential parking is preserved and not subject to spillover from the commercial districts. Developers feel that meeting parking requirements is one of the major obstacles to project approval and therefore seek the easiest and most cost-effective way of accomplishing this. These stakeholder groups all tend to view smart growth policies as radical changes that threaten their comfort and look to take away their valuable parking. In reality, smart growth policies seek to do the opposite by promoting increased efficient use of parking. Educating the stakeholders and responding to their concerns is a critical element of implementing new parking management policies.

Land Use

The traditional view towards parking has been that it is an assumed provision of new development as tenants need to be guaranteed parking. Smart growth parking policies present an alternative approach to land use as they seek to reduce the impact of parking on land by providing less of it. As a set of policies that are in their infancy stages, the changes they propose disrupt the comfort level established by more traditional policies because they are new and unknown. Despite these perceptions, smart growth policies can help to promote more efficient land use through higher density development. The City of Mountain View uses its established Transit Overlay Zone that allows increases to the floor area ratios of office and R&D uses in exchange for transit-oriented improvements (e.g. reduced parking requirements).

Economics

Parking has been traditionally viewed by many as a public good that all are entitled to and therefore holds an inherent value. Cities, developers, and residents alike have paid for parking through a variety of means: direct financing, development fees, and higher taxes. Smart growth parking policies provide new ways of thinking about parking financing by offering these groups payment options. Through such means as the "unbundling" of parking, the costs of parking are separated from the price of development, thereby providing people with alternative travel options.

Institutional Requirements

Parking requirements have long been based on established zoning codes and regulations that seek to advance the developmental goals of the City as a whole. Smart growth parking policies seek to revise and propose the use of new methodologies for instituting parking requirements. As such, these policies challenge the established tradition and create concern among cities because they are new and the extent of their applicability is unknown. San Francisco's establishment of a parking maximum in the City's Mission Bay district is one such example whereby old parking requirements were replaced by a maximum parking of one space per unit, effectively placing a cap on the amount of parking that could be provided by developers.

Political Will

Politicians take risks when they support new initiatives and generally will not do so unless they are assured full support by their constituents. Smart growth parking policies tend to affect the price and supply of parking. Typically, politicians tend to distance themselves from policies that are controversial and therefore can pose a significant obstacle to the institution of smart growth policies. However, if the stakeholder groups become supporters of these policies, the political decision makers will feel comfortable in moving forward. The new special downtown parking district in Redwood City is an excellent example of this.

Testing of New Policies

As with any new process, the implementation of smart growth policies will naturally be met with some degree of skepticism and generate questions about their applicability and potential degree of success. Smart growth policies present innovative ways of addressing traditional parking problems. For example, cities traditionally use parking meters with time limits to promote high turnover in busy downtowns and commercial areas. Even though new technology has existed to replace the parking meters for many years, it is only recently that cities like Berkeley, Redwood City, and San Francisco have been willing to take the risk to try a new technology. Once a few cities have success with a new policy or program, it is much easier for other cities to follow suit.

CONCLUSION

Through examining the range and types of national parking policy guides, manuals and standards, as well as common and less typical Bay Area parking policies, this paper provides a foundation for local jurisdictions to consider in creating or reforming their parking policies to better support smart growth, transit-oriented growth and downtown infill. A key finding is that of the 14 Bay Area cities surveyed as part of this effort, all of them have in place one or more Smart Growth-oriented parking policies. This suggests that the adoption of such policies may not be the biggest obstacle for cities, and that the main obstacle may be to find true opportunities where all the critical stakeholders agree to actually put these policies into action. A number of cities, from within the Bay Area and beyond, already have established innovative parking policies and new practices that can be regarded as "best practices" for smart growth, TOD and downtown infill; these will be examined in detail in the upcoming Task 3.1 paper. These two papers will be key elements supporting the Parking Management Toolbox which is the ultimate product of this study.